Board of Legal Document Preparers Certification and Licensing Division 1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 104 Phoenix, Arizona 85007 (602) 452-3378

4.

б

IN THE SUPREME COURT STATE OF ARIZONA

DETITION TO AMEND RULE 31(d),
ARIZONA RULES OF THE SUPREME
COURT.

Supreme Court No. R-11-0001

COMMENT IN RESPONSE TO
DETITIONERS' COMPROMISE
DEANGUAGE FOR PETITION TO
DETITION TO
DETIT

Pursuant to Arizona Code of Judicial Administration ("ACJA") § 7-208(D)(4)(b), the Board of Legal Document Preparers submits this comment in response to the Petitioners' Compromise Language for Petition to Amend Rule 31(d), Arizona Rules of Supreme Court ("Petitioners' Compromise Language") filed on June 3, 2011 by Edward Novak, Scott Rodgers and Ronda Fisk. The Board of Legal Document Preparers filed an Amended Comment expressing opposition to the original Petition on May 9, 2011. The Board of Legal Document Preparers was not involved in the subsequent drafting of the "compromise language" or any related discussions.

Having reviewed and considered the Petitioners' Compromise Language, the Board of Legal Document Preparers does not believe the proposed alternative language will overcome the significant protection of the public issues already addressed in the Board of Legal Document Preparers' Amended Comment. The offered alternative exception reads:

A condominium unit owner's association, as defined by A.R.S. § 33-1241, and a planned community association, as defined by A.R.S. § 33-1802, may be represented in the preparation, execution, and recordation of notices of liens created pursuant to A.R.S. § 33-1256 and § 33-1807 by an officer or employee of a management company who is not an

active member of the state bar if the management company has a contract with the association that gives the management company primary responsibility for the management of the association.

б

ACJA § 7-208(C) expressly reflects the Court's desire to protect the public from possible harm caused by non-lawyers through the establishment of minimum core competencies, and performance and ethical standards for non-lawyers and business entities who provide legal document preparation services to self-representing individuals and entities. The Board of Legal Document Preparers believes the adoption of either the originally proposed exception, or the alternative language submitted by way of the Petitioners' June 3, 2011 comment, will expose homeowners and self-representing associations to possible harm from management companies and their unregulated employees who have not been required to demonstrate minimum competencies, who are not required to adhere to established professional standards, and who cannot be held accountable for the legal services they provide. Further, the Board of Legal Document Preparers asserts adoption of either proposal will set a dangerous precedent and open the door for other non-lawyers who offer specialized legal services to seek similar exceptions tailored to circumvent regulatory oversight and accountability.

No provision of ACJA § 7-201 or ACJA § 7-208 authorizes a certified legal document preparer to act in a representative capacity on behalf of a customer; including but not limited to signing documents for a customer. ACJA § 7-208(J)(5)(b) reads, in part:

A legal document preparer shall not represent they are authorized to practice law in this state, nor shall the legal document preparer provide legal advice or services to another by expressing opinions, either verbal or written, or by representing another in a judicial, quasi-judicial, or administrative proceeding, or other formal dispute resolution process, except as authorized in Rule 31(d), Rules of the Supreme Court.

If the originally proposed exemption or the "compromise language" is adopted by the Court and thereby added to Rule 31(d), the Board of Legal Document Preparers remains concerned the protection of the public, specifically that of homeowners and the self-

representing associations, will be compromised by the lack of regulation and accountability on the part of the property management companies and their employees.

Pursuant to ACJA § 7-208(D)(4)(b), the Board of Legal Document Preparers recommends the Court deny the original Petition and reject the Petitioners' Compromise Language.

DATED this <u></u> day of <u>/ine</u>

Les Krambeal, Chair

Board of Legal Document Preparers

1	A copy of the foregoing hand delivered and/or mailed this day of, 2011, to:
2	Arizona Supreme Court
3	Clerk of the Court 1501 West Washington Street
4	Phoenix, Arizona 85007
5	Nina Preston, Assistant Counsel Administrative Office of the Court
6	1501 West Washington Street, 4 th Floor Phoenix, Arizona 85007
7	
8	Edward F. Novak Polsinelli Shughart, PC
9	One East Washington Street, Suite 1200 Phoenix, Arizona 85004
10	Scott W. Rodgers
11	Rhonda R. Fisk Osborn Maledon, PA
12	2929 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2100 Phoenix, Arizona 85012
13	Filoellix, Arizolia 83012
14	
15	By: Vardec
16	Kandace French, Programs Specialist Certification and Licensing Division
17	
1.8	Y:\BOARDS COMMITTEES COMMISSION\LEGAL DOCUMENT PREPARERS\AGENDA - MATERIALS\2011\JUNE 9, 2011TELEPHONIC\R11-0001 COMPROMISE LANGUAGE COMMENT.DOC
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
l	